

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Vol. V, No. 15

September 17, 1945

\$1.50 per year ; 10 cents per copy

Japan's Surrender

IN the hours directly following Japan's acceptance of surrender terms, there was a peculiar illusion that we had suddenly moved into a world united for peace. Perhaps this illusion came from the stream of radio broadcasts, ringing the changes on "this is it." Perhaps it was the only possible reaction to an experience of relief and hope too vast for words.

It is dangerous to house too long the illusion that military victory has settled the basic issues around which the war was waged. The war and the peace are not two separate chapters. They are parts of a continued story of the struggle of men to live co-operatively. Each era brings some violent cumulation of this struggle. Each generation prepares for succeeding generations some new horror devised to test the will for survival.

The real measure, therefore, of the gains and losses from this last Great War is an estimate of changes wrought by the war in the attitudes of people: Are they more or less ready to accept the fact that the world is one, and order the institutions of society accordingly? In the long run, the effect of the war on the inclination of the minds and hearts of men may be a more significant aftermath than any of the political and economic contrivings of the first post-war years.

We know little about the effect of these past years on what people think about life. The secret weapon which has dwarfed old-time wars into relative insignificance has now been demonstrated. We accept it, as we accept the mysteries of radio. The discoveries represented by the atomic bomb are here to stay. Whether these discoveries are to be used for the destruction or for the enhancement of civilized living rests ultimately on the attitudes of the people.

We do not know as yet whether life has more meaning for people or less, because of the blasting experiences of war. Yet only as the act of living is invested with rich meaning and purpose can there be any control of the rising tides of forces aimed to destroy life.

These are days for re-study of the statements made during the war by religious bodies, affirming

their agreements on the key principles for an enduring peace. On one of these principles alone the future course of the world's history could be determined for good or for ill: "the dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive actions of national governments and international organization: States, as well as individuals, must repudiate racial, religious or other discriminations in violation of these rights."

This principle is honored in the Charter produced by the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. But the Charter is merely a pledge that life shall be so organized that all people everywhere can find that satisfying meaningfulness which alone makes life worth living—either for an individual or for a national grouping. Meaning, significance cannot be enacted by pronouncements or edicts. We the people must find and develop it in the smallest areas of our common life.

The war has stirred men to great affirmations of human brotherhood, but it has also roiled up in all of us those traditional uncertainties which have delayed our fulfillment as a democracy.

"There *are* superior and inferior races."

"Economic and political affairs *are* too large and complicated to be controlled by all the people."

"Business and industry *can't* be run for the mutual benefit of employers and employees."

These are some of the "however's" that have lurked in the minds of all sorts of people, stronger than the affirmation of religious faith, quick to find expression in every phase of community and national life. It may be that the fear that democracy won't work is stronger than the hope that it will.

In the war years every detail of our living and working has had but one relevance—its contribution to the strength of the nation in its struggles on many fronts. What objective will unify us now that the military phase of the war is over?

We could hold together in the sterile and miserable unity of fear. One expert has proposed the building of underground cities. The construction job would last about twenty years, and provide work

for millions of men and women. "It's drastic, and the cost would be immense, but it's the only way we can be sure of surviving."

In the rejoicing over the surrender of Japan there was a note of sober concern with something more than mere survival. It is in our tradition to be moved by faith in the future. We are growing in our understanding of the role of this nation in the world of tomorrow.

If in relief over the end of the war we lived for a few hours in an illusion of peace attained, life will catch up with us in the decisions which this nation must make within the next few months. The direction which we shall take in these successive decisions of national policy will tell us more about what the war has done to the thinking of the people than can be now surmised.

R. E. Mc.

War Wounds in Europe

ROGER SHINN

AMERICA, Britain, and Russia have won a war in Europe. What to do with that victory is now a problem that confounds the ablest statesmanship of our time. When one recalls how inadequate was the best thought of twenty or even ten years ago in understanding the course that history was taking, humility becomes the first requirement for those who would look ahead. Yet we must be bold. For the ferments of history that will produce the future are at work now, and the decisions and policies that will shape this future are the immediate concern today of "The Big Three" and of all who have felt the havoc of this war.

For an understanding of what is going on within Europe, there may be some value in the observations and reflections of one who saw the death throes of Nazi Germany from the inside. As a prisoner of war, I was in Germany from the time of the "Battle of the Bulge" last December until almost V-E Day. Most of the time I was marching about Germany, as our captors moved us ahead of the advancing Russian and American armies. In the process I saw three areas of Germany before Allied armies invaded them: the Moselle Valley, the Northeast, and Bavaria. There is much that a prisoner of war does not see, but I had unusual opportunities to talk to German civilians and soldiers, and to see the effect of war on the country.

Germany Is Defeated

It is a matter of record that Nazi Germany is defeated. I am convinced that the defeat is complete enough that there is no danger of the re-establishment of a German Reich or of Prussian militarism that can threaten the world again. Field Marshal Montgomery, the Kilgore Committee, and others, it is true, fear that Germany will seek to rearm and once again dominate Europe. But because this is the one obvious danger that the Allied occupation is determined to prevent, and because of the extent of Germany's defeat, this cannot happen. Dorothy Thomp-

son has quoted General Devers as saying that Germany's war-making potential is destroyed for fifty years; and with the swift movement of contemporary history, she says, this means forever.

The proof of the defeat is seen in physical destruction, in manpower losses, and in the national psychology. The demolition of cities, factories, bridges, and rail facilities is well known. The tremendous job of reconstruction must be done by a people who have suffered enormous military and civilian casualties (including many prisoners being retained in Russia), and who have lost the thousands of slave laborers who worked the factories and farms a few months ago.

Harder than these factors to evaluate is the German psychology. As far as I have observed it, it is the psychology of defeat. It was only the complete domination of the Nazi government, with its elimination of any possible rival leaders, that kept Germany fighting to the end. The retreating soldiers grumbled, but obeyed. Even some of the SS units lost their morale, though here fanatic pride and propaganda that the Allies would never allow an SS soldier to surrender, kept many units fighting viciously. Elsewhere war-weariness was obvious for months before the end. The one word heard again and again through the length and breadth of Germany was *kaput*—which means broken, ruined, no good, done for. Over and over I heard German soldiers mutter, "*All' ist kaput in Deutschland.*"

There are, of course, small groups within Germany who may keep alive some of the Nazi spirit. As late as February, I saw an impressive attempt to maintain a high spirit and discipline among some *Luftwaffe* youths who were carefully shielded on a Baltic island from the carnage of combat and the disillusion of civilian Germany. Prisoners in the U. S., mostly from Rommel's elite *Afrika Korps*, will return well-fed and strong, many of them still blatant Nazis. The reaction of such men to the defeatism of Germany will be important. But for a revival of a

powerful Germany, with ambitions of domination, the resources—psychological and physical—are lacking.

This in no sense lessens the dangers to the world in central Europe. It means only that the danger does not come from a revival of the Reich. What else may come out of the maelstrom of races, the combination of despair and remnants of fanaticism, physical suffering, and economic and sociological maladjustments is the problem that threatens us now. The danger here is acute.

The modern world has given convincing proof that men cannot live without faiths and ideologies. Defeatism and despair cannot remain the ground of life. There are already cries for food, homes, and coal. Soon there will be cries for some sort of gospel to replace the old ideologies. Not only Germany, but Poland, France, Spain, Italy, Greece, and the Balkans may be involved. This is the greatest problem we face, and the one which we are least prepared to meet. Germany, as the scene of the greatest turmoil, may be the hotbed for generation of ideas that can sweep over Europe. It may be some form of communist ideology, or something very different. Whatever it is, it may shape our future.

Germany is defeated. Danger is not in restoration of the Reich. But there is danger in Germany.

German War Guilt

Many people (including the Gallup Poll) ask: Was it the German people, or their political leaders, who were responsible for the war? The question does not allow an answer. Was it the American people, or their political leaders, who were responsible for the shipment of war materials to Japan before the war? Obviously the degrees of guilt are very different among different groups of people. An understanding of German war guilt is even more difficult.

First, it must be recalled that the Second World War arose from a great variety of causes—racial, economic, sociological, psychological, and political. All the great nations of the Western Hemisphere must share the guilt of contributing to these causes. It should be unnecessary to mention this now. But the same America that was once so hard to convince of the essential destructiveness of Nazism is now sold on the proposition that German wickedness, and this alone, caused the war. Recognizing the fallacy of this, we can still state that the destructive influences of contemporary Western civilization reached their culmination in Nazism, and that Nazi Germany must bear the major responsibility for this war.

Germany had, of course, its vigorous Nazi movement, typified in its political leaders and in its SS troops. The party reached down into the villages, where I have seen the contemptible local leaders strut haughtily like little Hitlers. I have seen such a man

spit in the face of an American officer prisoner, and order around the town folk in his love of displaying a uniform and authority. In the villages, he was ridiculous, and seemed like an intruder in the population. In the cities, he looked more natural, for Nazism was stronger here. In the industrial areas I found a few people able to spout anti-Semitism, anti-Bolshevism, and doctrines of Nordic superiority as emphatically and nonsensically as Goebbels.

Opposing this Nazi element was the resistance movement. From all signs, it could do little after the attempt on Hitler's life last July. But those who point to the crimes of the Gestapo as evidence of the guilt of Germany must remember that those crimes are themselves the proof of Nazism's fear of the resistance.

Within the limits of my observations (principally the rural areas, in the months when war-weariness gripped the land) the majority of people were neither blatant Nazis nor determined resisters. They had little in common with Nazism's grandiose dreams or fanatic doctrines. Anti-semitism, though sometimes bitter, was not prominent. The German common people, with little interest in politics, had gone along with their government when it was bettering their lot and winning victories, and were now tired of it when it was losing.

It is, of course, no virtue that a people get tired of war when they are losing. On the other side, it should be said that it is no special wickedness in a nation which makes it resist conquerors. Some of the attitudes which the advancing American armies found, and attributed to the Nazification of Germany, might better be regarded as evidence of the innate patriotism of any people who face destruction. The swastika and other Nazi symbols, so common in Germany, are often simply the only patriotic symbols left in a country which for years has known no others. Such indiscriminating patriotism may not be a virtue, but it is not distinctively German.

Throughout hundreds of miles of Germany, I found the people surprisingly friendly. I saw them not as a member of a conquering army, but as a rather miserable prisoner of war; and although they knew that the Americans were conquering Germany, they had little reason to hide their feelings from a group of prisoners. In the areas where our bombers had done their work, hostility was obvious. But elsewhere the people were usually friendly. The German farmer or *hausfrau* traded food for American soap or cigarettes, and sometimes, in Bavaria especially, the people gave us food for no reason except generosity. Often I saw a simple piety and natural kindness entirely foreign to their Nazi government.

The fatal quality of such people is their *non-political attitude*. Government is one of the facts of life, like geography or climate. It may help them or hurt them, but they are not responsible for it.

They only accept it and adjust to it. They do not feel that it is or can be something of their own making. How far this attitude can be changed is one of the most important factors in the future of these people.

I recall one sergeant in the company that guarded our column of prisoners through Germany. Friendly and helpful to the Americans, he was a conscientious non-commissioned officer of his own army. He was a veteran of the First World War, and his family had met a war-tragedy in this war. He talked frankly of the destructiveness and futility of war, and how two wars had ruined his life. This sergeant had been a physical education instructor in the Hitler Youth, and spoke of that job as dispassionately as if it had been in the Boy Scouts or the public schools. Politics had no significance for him. Wars and the national history were a fate that governed him.

I knew many less conscientious German soldiers who, as defeat drew near, would have quit or deserted if they could. One captain whom I knew, deserted with an escaping American Jewish captain! Most of the officers (lieutenants and captains) whom I met were not of the professional officer group, although they had been in the army now for years. They did their military duty, serving the country rather than the party, and felt no responsibility for what their government did. They were the victims of history; the making of history was not their concern.

The ordinary Germans were smothered by the blanket of Nazi propaganda. During March I read several issues of the Munich *Beobachter*. At the bottom of the front page was the official news communiqué; it was fairly accurate, though obscure. All the major articles were a half-editorial, half-news type of story designed to arouse desperate resistance and hate for the enemy. A few were directed against General Eisenhower and the Western armies, especially the "terror-bombings." But the great theme was hatred for Russia. The Red Armies, said the newspaper, burned everything in their paths, killed everyone in sight, wrought every conceivable work of hatred and destruction. The German people feared and hated the Russians beyond American comprehension. When this propaganda became so convincing that soldiers sought to desert to the Americans rather than fight and perhaps fall captive to the Russians, a new threat was necessary. They were told that the Americans would turn over their German prisoners to Russia at the end of the war.

The effectiveness of the propaganda may be seen in the fact that we Americans, hearing nothing else and seeing the very honest fears of the German soldiers and civilians around us, gradually began to assume subconsciously that the story was true. We were completely cynical about Nazi propaganda; yet

in five months' time, we began to be its victims. It is obvious what this could do to a nation in twelve years. An individual citizen can hardly be blamed for falling under its influence. Yet a nation cannot escape guilt for being duped by the propaganda of its own government.

The war guilt of Germany, then, lies first with an aggressive Nazi group, who crushed democratic and Christian opposition, and committed the crimes of the Nazi state. It lies, second, with a population fed on propaganda, who accepted their government, particularly when it was successful, and who failed to oppose wrong or accept responsibility for their government.

Many observers in conquered Germany have remarked that the German people have little sense of guilt for their crimes. I think this is true, and easy to understand. Most Americans consider that the U. S. made a mistake in its policies toward Spain during her Civil War, and toward Japan before Pearl Harbor. But few Americans regard these policies as more than mistakes. America could hardly be said to have a sense of guilt for its responsibility in the conquest of China or the defeat of Spanish Republicanism. The Nazi crimes, of course, were more enormous and more direct than the policies of America. But the German people, without a democratic feeling of responsibility for their government, are not likely to feel their guilt in the crimes of that government.

The Future of Germany

A successful occupation and government of Germany will require all the knowledge and political acumen that the Allied nations can muster. My experiences have given me no certainty as to the best specific plans. I would, however, urge two propositions as a basis for any thinking about policies.

The first proposition is that we abandon the concept of *punishment* in dealing with Germany. Discipline is a necessity. But history is demonstrating the prophetic truth: "Vengeance is mine," saith the Lord."

Anything that we can inflict will be puny compared with the punishment Germany has taken in losing this war. I was in one of Germany's cities when it was bombed by Flying Fortresses. Among a group of combat-experienced American officers, all agreed that this was among the most terrifying things we had known. Yet this was the thing that German civilians experienced and dreaded day after day. The shattered ruins of a once great country, and the tragic cost in human life and aspiration dwarf anything we can add.

On the day when I was liberated by the American army, I talked to some of the German soldiers who had been our guards and were now American prisoners. One of them had once given me some bread—the best gift that a prisoner of war could

receive. I told him that I hoped he could go home soon.

"But I have no home," he said. "My home was in Aachen. It is destroyed. My wife and child were killed there. I have no place to go." He stopped and lifted his hands. "I have two hands. I can work. I will stay here and work."

I looked around. There was a sergeant whose wife, about to bear a child, had been put in a wagon in Poland to be evacuated before the advancing Russians. That had been three months before, and he had heard nothing from her since. There was the *Hauptmann*; his family was dead and his home destroyed. There were several soldiers who had received no mail in months and had no idea where their families were or whether they were alive. What can further *punishment* possibly mean to men who have seen war cost them this, and who now face a futile future in a ruined country?

But disaster may not be punishment. Israel saw in the threat of destruction a disaster; it took Amos, the prophet of God, to tell Israel that this disaster was judgment and punishment. Germany has suffered disaster. But insofar as the nation lacks a sense of guilt, this disaster has not the spiritual quality of punishment. What will make Germany understand punishment? One thing will be the execution of war criminals, provided it is done in such a way that the German people will recognize that these criminals are being punished for offenses against the very plainest morality and law. There may also be some value in the propaganda designed to inform the German people of the crimes and guilt of their government, though this may come with ill grace from a conqueror. A more genuine realization may come through those elements of the German church that have preserved their integrity throughout the reign of Nazism. A fellowship of contrite American and German churches might do much to redeem a pagan world.

The second proposition is that the policies of occupation be decided and enforced with a *clear purpose*. This looks too obvious to need statement. But it is ignored in too many discussions of Europe. For example, newspaper writers debate whether the Germans *deserve* additional food, without looking at the probable *effects* of food shortages. People argue over whether Germany should have a "hard" or "soft" peace. This poses the question in emotional terms that are irrelevant to the issue of the consequences. Perhaps we should make a "harder" peace for the known Nazis and a "softer" peace for others. Whatever the answers, the questions should be framed in terms of purpose and results. Wise decisions can be made only if each policy is chosen with regard to what it will accomplish in Europe.

A striking example of this false conception came to me in France after V-E Day. Most liberated prisoners were hopeful that Russia would control

most of Germany, because they thought that Russia would enforce a much more severe policy than lenient America and Britain. Yet the first news that we saw about the Russian occupation was a notice in the *Stars and Stripes* that Russia was reorganizing the symphony orchestra in Berlin! Stalin is not "soft," but he thinks of renewed cultural life when Americans hardly think beyond bare political and economic necessities. Conflicting reports make it difficult to judge Soviet policies, but it seems evident that Russia at least has definite purposes for Germany. It is the lack of a purpose that makes so much of our discussion of Europe futile.

Flying from deep within Germany to Le Harve, during V-E week, I passed over many of the battlefields and ruined towns of Europe. The towns were still battered, but in the fields the green of spring was fast covering the marks of the war just ended. From the sky the craters below looked like fast healing wounds on human flesh. The thought was inescapable: there are wounds of this war that will not be healed in my lifetime. I wondered how many generations it would take to heal this war's scars on history. I wondered whether the nations would find a surgery less destructive to the face of the earth and the lives of men.

A major part of the answer lies in Europe. It will take all of man's knowledge and wisdom to give a favorable answer. Christianity has no precise solutions. But with a Christian understanding of the depths of the problems of history, honest and thorough political thought can find answers that promise a future better than the dismal past.

Our Relations to Japan

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

IT was inevitable that the final surrender of Japan, ending the costliest war of human history, should be greeted with a delirium of joy all over the world, and in America particularly. It was the Japanese attack upon us which brought us into the war; and for many portions of our population Japan was a more natural enemy than Germany. Yet among the more sober and thoughtful sections of our nation the victory over Japan leaves a strange disquiet and lack of satisfaction.

There are many reasons for this. The most obvious one is that the victory was secured, or at least hastened, by the use of the atomic bomb. There is naturally a very great apprehension about the introduction of this frightful instrument into the science of warfare, and an uneasiness of conscience about its immediate use in this war, in order to hasten its end. But the use of this bomb was only the climax of the use of methods of warfare, including obliteration and incendiary bombing, which exceeded anything we used against Germany. The difference was not by design, but was caused by the fact that certain types of incendiary bombs were perfected too late to be used against Germany, but not too late for

Japan. Yet one is left uneasy by the difference; because we used more terrible instruments against the Japanese than they used against us; which would not have been the case in regard to Germany.

But we must go even further in analyzing the sense of disquiet in our relation to this fallen enemy. We not only used the most terrible weapons to encompass the defeat but we also proceeded against Japan with political warfare, which had gained its momentum from our conflict with Germany but which had little justification in our relations to Japan. We demanded unconditional surrender. The slogan of "unconditional surrender," falsely transferred from the realm of purely military relations to that of political relations, was unwise enough in our approach to Germany, and undoubtedly helped to arm our foe with the strength of a final desperation. But in our dealings with Germany we could at least quiet our uneasiness about the use of this slogan by the thought that Germany was in the clutches of a tyranny which had a slogan of its own, which matched our slogan. It was: "All or nothing." The Nazis were determined to leave the nations in ruins, if they should fail to gain victory. They probably had the power in any case to hold a defeated and destroyed nation in the struggle until its cities were completely reduced to rubble; and the tyranny had operated with such efficiency that there was no possibility of establishing an alternate German government. We would have had to take over in Germany in any case, and try to rebuild the nation from the ground up.

The situation was different in Japan. Japanese militarists were probably as fanatic as the German Nazis. But many Americans have maintained (and subsequent events have proved their analysis to be correct) that Japan had various resources of sanity which Germany did not have. The imperial house could become a rallying point against the militarists. Furthermore there were industrialists and capitalists in Japan who would have been called "liberal" in another day. We do not vouch for their perfect virtue; but they were quite obviously opposed to the adventures of the military crowd from the beginning, and they most certainly contributed something to the political situation which made final capitulation possible. No doubt they were prompted primarily by motives of survival as a class. Despite the fact that there are no completely pure motives in politics (and possibly not in life), American liberalism recently allowed itself an orgy of the most nauseous self-righteousness; for liberal journals were almost unanimous in warning against any possible peace which might emanate from Japanese capitalists. This type of liberalism would rather annihilate a foe completely than enlist the aid of any elements in an enemy country which are not absolutely "pure." The policy is usually accompanied by the foolish hope that if we can completely destroy we will also be able to build a more ideal social structure out of these complete ruins. There is no vainer hope in human history; and it is prompted by a peculiarly dangerous type of "liberalism" in which the imperial power impulse has become strangely mixed with moral idealism. We will destroy nations in order to make "democracies" out of them.

As it happened Japan did finally sue for peace; and

proved thereby that it did have resources, which Germany lacked. It made only one condition. It desired to retain the imperial house. The motive behind this request was quite obviously that Japan wanted to avoid complete social chaos; for the imperial house is, of course, the apex of a whole hereditary and organic social structure, the destruction of which would mean decades of chaos and foreign intervention in its affairs. The governments of the world wisely decided to amend their "unconditional surrender" policy to allow for this condition. But not so all our liberal journalists and commentators. Almost with open voice they advised the government against this offer. Even Raymond Swing seemed certain that the emperor must go. "Americans United," an organization which includes almost all internationalist organizations of the nation, committed the absurdity of asking the President not only to reject the Japanese offer, but to hale the emperor before a war criminals court. Mayor LaGuardia solemnly advised the Japanese people to murder the emperor and thus insure peace.

We can hardly be proud of the sentiments expressed by Americans in general, and by "liberals" in particular, in the fateful days during which the surrender was negotiated. The wine of success is a very heady wine. No nation has ever embarked upon the hazardous business of ruling the world, in company with two partners, with a more blythe ignorance of the meaning of customs and continuities, of sentiments and unique loyalties among the people to be "ruled" than we. We have arrived at an ignorant idealism according to which the world is divided into two classes: American democrats and all the other "lesser breed without the law" who do not share our democratic creed and must therefore be fascists. If a man, such as Under-secretary Grew, with his long experience in Japan, expresses the conviction that the emperor ought not to be deposed of, there are liberal journalists who request his removal by the president on the ground that he is an appeaser of fascists. Thus the passions of war have introduced poison into the sentiments of liberalism; and the pride of a powerful nation has blinded the eyes of large elements in our populations, whose clear sight is necessary, if American power is to be used responsibly.

Instead of glorifying in the fact that now the Japanese Emperor will take orders "from an American General," a popular theme upon the radio in recent weeks, we might more profitably make a sober analysis of our assets and liabilities in the task which confronts us as we seek to govern an Asiatic people. If we make that analysis honestly we will have to admit that our racial pride contributed to the tension which finally resulted in war with Japan; and that there are great perils that the incidents of the occupation of Japan will increase the racial animosity between the East and the West.

We must admit moreover that if Japan had not been quite so stupid and fanatic in its militaristic ventures, it might well have become the spearpoint of an Asiatic revolt against the white man's dominance. It may be a good thing for the peace of the world that Japan was not creative enough to be the leader of such a venture. But this still does not prove that it is a good thing for the white man to seek to govern an Asiatic people from

the ground up. We must destroy the war-making powers of Japan. Will we also have the wisdom to make our total occupation of the Islands as brief as possible and be content with more remote and less obvious control of the life of an alien people?

The pride of victors is always a great hazard to justice. When it is mixed with ethnic and color pride it may produce an intolerable arrogance.

All this does not mean that our cause against either Germany or Japan was not "just." We were indeed the executors of God's judgment yesterday. But we might remember the prophetic warnings to the nations of old, that nations which become proud because they

were divine instruments must in turn stand under the divine judgment and be destroyed. The virtues of men have only a short-range efficacy. We may be virtuous in this context; and just in that relationship; and the instruments of divine judgment in performing such and such a peculiar responsibility. But this does not guarantee our virtue tomorrow. The same power which encompassed the defeat of tyranny may become the foundation of a new injustice. If ever a nation needed to be reminded of the perils of vainglory, we are that nation in the pride of our power and our victory. The Pauline warning fits us exactly: "Be not therefore highminded, but fear."

The World Church: News and Notes

Bishop Bell Condemns Use of Atomic Bomb

The Rev. George Kennedy Bell, Bishop of Chichester, condemned the Allies' use of the atomic bomb.

In a letter to the *Times* of London, the Bishop wrote that the destructive motive that impelled the discovery and its first use to obliterate two towns "surely are things which all who care for man's moral equipment are bound to condemn."

The letter of the Bishop, who once said of the bombing of German towns that it "must cause great searching of heart among those who were resolute champions of the Allied cause," also asserted:

"At the beginning of the European war no words were too bad for the bombardment of Warsaw and Rotterdam and in its closing stage the use of V-bombs was similarly censured. But the havoc then wrought by the German forces cannot be compared with ruin caused in Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the atomic bomb."

In conclusion the Bishop wrote: "There are certain deeds which science should not do. There are certain actions for which scientists should not be made conscripts by any nation. And surely the extermination of any civilian population by any nation is one of these."

Canterbury Sees Peace Still to Be Won

A warning that "the world has not yet gained peace" was voiced by Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, who spoke at a national thanksgiving service in St. Paul's Cathedral in London.

"Conflicts and sufferings and inhumanities continue," he said. "Man is not everywhere free, and man is sinful still. Peace has to be won, and its winning requires the labors of many nations and peoples. We can only do our part but God lays upon us to do that faithfully."

(RNS)

Mexican Bishop Backs Campaign Against Illiteracy

The Bishop of Sinaloa, Most Rev. Agustin Aguirre y Ramos, has sent a letter to parishes in his diocese urging support of the Mexican government's current campaign against illiteracy.

"With the country pledged to a fight against illiteracy," the Bishop wrote, "it is our obligation as Cath-

olics and as Mexicans to contribute toward diminishing the number of our brothers who live submerged in the obscurity of ignorance." (RNS)

Church Leader Warns Refugee Problem Is Increasing

Contrary to the popular impression, the refugee problem has been increasing, not decreasing, since the end of the war in Europe, the Rev. Henry Carter, head of the British Christian Council for Refugees, declared.

The British pastor explained that the crumbling of Germany has left countless displaced persons without citizenship. He estimated that the total of such stateless persons may run close to two million.

As international passports were issued through the League of Nations for such stateless persons after the last war, the United Nations should develop a new passport for the stateless today, Dr. Carter declared.

The other major conclusion he reached during his study of the question in Switzerland was that "it would be altogether wrong to force German Jews to go back to Germany."

Dr. Carter visited refugee camps where Switzerland is caring for thousands of the displaced persons. There have been more than 100,000 refugees in this country, which compares to the 90,000 peak reached in England during 1939. This Swiss total is beginning to decline as people find their ways home, but Dr. Carter said it is important that the number be cut at least as low as 30,000 or 35,000.

Speaking of the refugee situation in England, Dr. Carter stated that the number has been slowly whittled down to about 50,000. Some of these want to go to the United States and some want to become British citizens. Some of the old and sick will probably have to stay in the British Isles, he said. (RNS)

Swedish Primate Stresses Justice, Goodwill as Ways to Peace

Peace should invoke a spirit of penance and a determination to work wholeheartedly for justice and goodwill, Archbishop Erling Eidem, Primate of the Swedish Lutheran Church, urged in a message hailing the end of the war.

"It is a relief," the archbishop said, "that the second World War has ended after six horrible years that

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Secretary of Editorial Board*

signified a catastrophe greater than any in history. It is horrible to think of the huge losses of lives, the enormous devastation. It is horrible to consider to what abysses human brutality has sunk.

"What will come hereafter is a question for the future. The warring powers have laid down their arms, but peace is still not here. Enormous tasks await those who have the responsibility of deciding the new world order. Will this terrible war be succeeded by another?

"For Christians it is evident that the only way to salvation for humanity is in justice and goodwill. War is a symptom revealing humanity's inner condition. We are all responsible for the future. We must invoke penance and a wholehearted eagerness to work for justice, truth and goodness." (RNS)

Danish Primate Issues Peace Message

The "immense energy" of war must now be used for peace and reconstruction, Bishop Hans Fuglsang-Damgaard, Primate of the Danish Lutheran Church, said in a Victory Day message. Churches throughout Denmark held thanksgiving services on Sunday, August 19.

"The bloodiest war that mankind has ever experienced," the Danish primate declared, "is now ended. At this moment our hearts are filled with gratitude to God.

"It is our belief and hope that the immense energy used in the war will now be devoted to the reconstruction of a new world. We must even consider it a source of great satisfaction that the new atomic bomb was not used to greater destruction.

"We now have conditions in the world in which the Gospel may be freely heard and practiced. The Gospel is strong enough to build a world, not based on revenge or hatred, but on righteousness, truth and conciliation." (RNS)

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-46

War Against Evil Forces Asked by Berggrav

The peace declaration must be followed by a declaration of war against evil forces in the world, declared Bishop Eivind Berggrav, Primate of the Norwegian Lutheran Church.

"We must be happy that the terrible period of war has ended," the Bishop declared, "but we must also be on guard against what may await us in peace. We must be mobilized against the evil forces of envy and revenge. The people's moral and religious forces must meet this evil or it will triumph over us again within the next generation.

"Out of the world's present hopelessness, we must find a way and a goal. The world is suffering today, but we must not yield. We must, rather, gather our forces to rebuild society.

"England, once a lonely, small people, seemed lost, but the will to sacrifice, and the spirit of loyalty triumphed. The world must clearly understand that unless the spirit of loyalty and unselfishness can be mobilized again, unless there is a declaration of war against evil and sin, the peace will be lost." (RNS)

British Churches to Care For German Children

The Christian Council for Refugees has obtained the consent of the British government for the entry into this country of up to 1,000 children from the Buchenwald, Belsen and other Nazi concentration camps, it was revealed by the Rev. Henry Carter, chairman of the board of management.

About one-fourth of the children will be cared for by church organizations, Dr. Carter said. (RNS)

Fifty U. S. Protestant Missionaries Expected in China

Fifty Protestant missionaries are expected in Chungking from the United States in September, the Chinese National Christian Council announced. They will be the first replacements sent to China since before the war.

Seven of the missionaries, who are being sent here at the Council's request, are Methodists. The others represent Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Seventh Day Adventist, and Church of Christ denominations.

Permission to travel has been granted by the U. S. Embassy, the Council stated, and the group will leave the United States as soon as Army authorization is received. Most of the missionaries will be sent to newly liberated areas. (RNS)

Author in This Issue

Captain Roger Shinn, after graduating from Union Seminary with highest honors, waived his exemption as a theological student and entered the army as a private. He went to Europe as captain of a mechanized company and was captured by the Germans in the break through of December, 1944. His imprisonment in Germany gave him an intimate view of the German situation which makes the account which we are publishing in this issue particularly valuable.